

**WEST VALLEY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

September 24, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chairman Harold Woodruff at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Woodruff, Brent Fuller, Terri Mills, Phil Conder, and Jason Jones

ABSENT:

Jack Matheson and Mary Jayne Davis

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

John Janson, Steve Pastorik, Steve Lehman, Ron Weibel, Hannah Thiel,
and Nichole Camac

WEST VALLEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

Nicole Cottle, Deputy City Attorney

AUDIENCE

Approximately eighteen (18) people were in the audience

ZONE CHANGE APPLICATIONS:

Z-7-2008 Amended

Zions Securities Corp. and Ivory Development

Between 3100 South and Lake Park blvd. and east of Daybury Dr.

Development Agreement Amendment

11.12 acres

Last month, the Planning Commission recommended approval of a zone change from M (manufacturing) to R-1-8 (residential, single family, minimum lot size 8,000 square feet) for 11.12 acres owned by Zions Securities Corporation within the proposed Plat C of Highbury. The recommendation for approval was subject to a development agreement. The purpose of this latest application is to amend the proposed development agreement for Plat C as well as the approved development agreement for Plat B.

Attached to this report are the original layout for Plats B and C and the proposed layout for Plats B and C. For the original layout, the development agreement the Planning Commission approved reduced the Plat C single family to 72, which means that the total number of dwelling units (444) between the original and the proposed layout is the same. Below is a summary of the changes between the original and proposed layouts:

- In the original layout, all of the townhomes were located in the northeast corner of Plat C. In the proposed layout, the same number of townhomes is proposed; however, they are now in two locations.
- The number of parkside homes has increased from 55 to 89.
- The number of single family homes has decreased from 230 to 196.
- The original layout for Plat B was exclusively single family homes with no park space. The proposed layout for Plat B includes single family homes, townhomes, and a 31,083 square foot park and clubhouse.
- In the original layout, about 70% of the parkside homes are designed around a linear green space where homes face each other instead of the street. In the proposed design, this percentage is reduced to about 40%. However, the result is that the open space for the parkside homes is now consolidated into larger park spaces that become more useable parks.

Also attached to this report is the latest development agreement proposal that incorporates the changes listed above. The proposed additions are underlined and deletions are noted in the margins.

Staff received a call from an owner of one of the existing single family homes within Plat B. He was opposed to the idea of having townhomes in Plat B since, when he purchased his home, Plat B was planned as all single family home lots.

Staff Alternatives:

- Approval of the development agreement changes as proposed by the applicant.

- Approval of the development agreement changes as proposed by the applicant with the exception that the number of parkside homes shall remain 55 and the number of single family homes shall remain 230.
- Approval of the development agreement proposed by the applicant with changes as determined during the public hearing.
- Continuance, for reasons determined during the public hearing.
- Denial of the development agreement changes. The development agreement recommended for approval on August 27, 2008 should be forwarded to the City Council together with the zone change application for their review.

<u>Applicant:</u>	<u>Applicant:</u>	<u>Opposed:</u>	<u>Opposed:</u>
Chris Gamvroulas	Mike Hathorne	Steve Freebairn	David Echevera
Ivory Homes	Zions Securities	5356 Sefton Dr.	2963 S. 5375 W.
<u>Opposed:</u>	<u>Opposed:</u>		
Michelle Taukluea	Brooke Freebairn		
2906 S. Sefton Dr.	5356 Sefton Dr.		

Discussion: Steve Pastorik presented the application. Chris Gamvroulas, the applicant, explained the original plan and stated that no plan is perfect and should always be treated as a living document. He explained that after receiving internal feedback and feedback from the City, he decided to look into spreading out the townhomes a little and playing with several different ideas. He explained that one goal was to balance out the paseos and the single family homes. After several meetings, it was determined that pulling the paseos toward the top of the project made more sense and he explained the reason the total number of them increased was because of the road configurations. If this was arranged in any other way, the result would be smaller single family lots which is not something Ivory wishes to happen. Mr. Gamvroulas explained that the area east of Kohl's changed several times from commercial use to office use to what it is now. The markets are evolving and changing and because of these changes, townhomes seem to be the most logical choice for placement in this area. He explained that Ivory has been commended and is very proud of the quality of their townhome product. The idea in this new plan is to develop the townhomes down by the busier road of 3100 South. Mr. Gamvroulas explained that several ideas of creating connections were explored but because of the placement of the townhomes and the shape of the area, solutions were very limited. It was finally decided that three separate roads would be brought down to a single road for access. Mr. Gamvroulas explained that the City implied a clubhouse that included more open space was important but Ivory wanted to ensure there was a balance of size. They want something that will be big enough to host an event but also something that is small enough that it won't take away from the West Valley City Recreational Center across 3100

South. He explained traffic circles have been included in the new design because Ivory felt it was important to make good pedestrian and vehicle connections.

Phil Conder stated that a month ago he questioned the linear parkways for the paseos. Now looking at this configuration, 2/3 to 3/4 of the paseos front out onto a road rather than each other. Commissioner Conder stated that this isn't what is seen in Daybreak and doesn't reflect the original goal of the development. Mr. Gamvroulas replied that there is now more open space in the area which is what a lot of the homes lacked. He added that those that are facing a roadway have a larger setback as well. Commissioner Conder stated that the linear parkways were desirable and now those have been lost. Mr. Gamvroulas disagreed because there is now more open space, just less homes fronting into each other. Mike Hathorne, representing Zions Securities, clarified that the open space is still there but is larger and more park-like than when they were linear. He explained that the linear nature of the parks worked when they lined up straight but as they turn the corner, it became harder to create the linear parks. Phil Conder stated that he has a problem with the ones fronting the road in the center and added that he would like to see single family frontages instead. Chris replied that the garages and driveways would be less attractive than the porches of the paseo homes. Terri Mills questioned if there is any on-street parking? Chris stated that there would be and indicated on the design plan where this would be located. Jason Jones questioned if there is a demand for the paseo homes. Mr. Gamvroulas indicated that they have been selling well in Daybreak with 10 homes sold in two months. He added that people often choose between the townhomes and the paseos according to the price range they are looking at. Jason Jones asked if the clubhouse intended to service the townhomes. Mr. Gamvroulas replied that this is at the development stage and as everything progresses this will be determined according to what the reaction is. Commissioner Jones questioned if there is any single family product that can be rear loaded. Mr. Gamvroulas replied no.

Steve Freebairn explained that he is a neighbor already residing in the single family neighborhood and is strongly opposed to this proposed change. He presented the Planning Commission with a petition against this change signed by nearly all the residents in the neighborhood. He explained that they all like the single family design in one section and that is why they chose to invest in this neighborhood. He added that he spoke with a resident of the townhomes who was also against the change because they chose their area because they are nice, elite townhomes and don't want them to be mixed with anything else. Phil Conder questioned if the density increasing is the concern if the single family homes are shifted. Mr. Freebairn replied that his family and several others were sold on the fact that it was a single family home area.

David Echevera explained that the single family neighborhood drew him into the area. He complained that too many townhomes are built in one area but that is not any reason to move some of them to a single family subdivision. He suggested a nicer entry if the concern was seeing the back properties of the single family

homes in the original designs. He stated that he bought his home assuming that the plans were 100% finalized.

Michelle Taukluea stated that she is a new resident to West Valley City and has been excited to work with Ivory. She explained that this change has been surprising but she does understand why Ivory feels they need to make these adjustments. However, she explained that she made a large financial decision based upon the plans that she saw in the model home and assumed were completely finalized.

Chris Gamvroulas stated that he understands and appreciates the concerns raised by the residents and added that he doesn't take customers for granted. However, he explained, there are realities in the market and other concepts that force evolution through the development process. He explained that he doesn't believe a resident of a townhome would be opposed to more. Mr. Gamvroulas proceeded to explain the evolution of the area and reasons behind each change made thus far. He indicated that the possible high school caused the dominoes to start reconfiguring and added that a community must be limited to preserve a home in this market. The proposed amendment should ensure that Plat B has activity and will continue to sell. Mr. Gamvroulas stated that he doesn't fully support the argument that the townhomes will affect the community in any negative way. Phil Conder questioned if it was implied the entire neighborhood would be single family to the people who have already purchased homes in the subdivision. Mr. Gamvroulas replied yes. Terri questioned whether the number of townhomes could be reduced so that they are still facing the front street but there are less of them as they get further north. Mr. Gamvroulas explained that it would be too difficult to align roads and get the geometry to work properly. Jason Jones questioned the price points for the 3 products. Mr. Gamvroulas stated that the townhomes start in the 170's, the paseos in the low 200's, and the single family home start at around the 230's and could go up to the low 400's. He stated that this is a great option and added that the value for a single family home doesn't diminish because it is near high density.

Brooke Freebairn stated that people have closed on their homes and are now obligated to live in this community. She stated that not everyone received notice and the people attending the hearing represent an entire subdivision. She explained that everyone who purchased these homes want to live in a neighborhood that is safe for raising children and is a good family oriented location. She explained that she has friends in the townhomes and there are great people that live there. However, these individuals are just starting out and aren't looking for a family oriented neighborhood. She stated that Ivory presented a good principal to begin with and they should stick with it. Steve Freebairn added that Ivory is selling single family homes and they have advertised their success. With this type of attractive neighborhood, selling the homes should not be a problem. He indicated that he is not concerned with having more green space because any park activities he wishes to participate in with his family can be

gained at the West Valley City Recreational Facility across the street. Jason Jones questioned if there were any other concerns other than the idea of the concept being changed. Mr. Freebairn explained that it looks good on paper but the streets are tight and the townhomes will increase traffic and the number of people. Brent Fuller asked if the residents would feel better if there was a physical separation between the townhomes and the single family residential area. Mr. Freebairn stated that he has talked to Mr. Gamvroulas on this and he would like a physical separation but in his mind that separation was the different sections throughout the subdivision. He stated that he would be less uncomfortable but would still prefer that Ivory stick with their original proposal.

Jason Jones stated that the total number of units haven't changed and questioned if it would be possible to keep plat B as it is but use the new proposal in plat C which would lower the number of homes. Terri Mills explained that she is sympathetic for the property owners but doesn't like the idea of having a fence. She stated that she had a lot of concerns with the changes originally but has since warmed up to the new concept. Phil Conder stated that he doesn't like the paseos in the new configuration and added that he had a lot questions originally that were all answered and now everything has been changed again. Chairman Woodruff explained that the paseos have grown on him and they remind him of streets in Washington D.C. Commissioner Mills agreed and added that the new proposal grew on her while she is normally resistant to change. She explained that she likes the open space and the added clubhouse. She suggested parking signs to help address vehicles parked on the road. Mr. Gamvroulas stated that land issues are being discussed and he can come back with another layout and try different configurations. He added that the paseos are mostly based on opinion. He added that new reconfigurations will be similar because road connections are needed.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for denial

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Mills	No
Chairman Woodruff	No

Split Vote - Z-7-2008– Motion Fails

Chairman Woodruff Called for a second motion.

Motion: Commissioner Jones moved for continuance.

Commissioner Conder seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous - Z-7-2008– Continued

SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

S-34-2008

E-Center Retail Subdivision – Lot 2 Amended

3100 South Decker Lake Drive

M Zone

4 Lots

5 Acres

BACKGROUND

Mark Green, is requesting an amendment of lot 2 in the E-Center Retail Subdivision. The request will also entail preliminary and final plat approval for the amended plat. The subject property is located north of 3100 South at Decker Lake Drive.

ISSUES:

The E-Center Retail Subdivision was recorded with the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office in May 2008. The original subdivision plat consisted of 2 lots on 14.5 acres. The proposed application will amend lot 2 to create lots 2A-2D. A flag lot is being proposed to resolve concerns expressed by Granger Hunter Improvement District.

The amended plat will provide a means for the applicant to sell each lot to create a small retail and/or commercial center. It is anticipated that these lots will accommodate uses that will accentuate the hotel, transit oriented development and entertainment uses in this part of the City. The Planning Commission has already reviewed and approved the Holiday Inn Express as well as the Edge at Decker Lake, both presently under construction.

The subdivision is located in the commercial overlay zone. All uses in this zone are considered conditional and will therefore be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Access to the subdivision will be gained from both Decker Lake Drive and 3100

South. Access in and through the various lots will be achieved by interior driveways. As development occurs, cross access easements will need to be recorded preserving these access points. Parcel A, which is located to the north, will be used for access and parking. During the review of the original plat, it was determined that access through Parcel A was acceptable, but that parking would be limited for E-Center overflow.

In addition to access easements, drainage easements will also exist to accommodate storm water. The developer will need to coordinate these with the City Engineering Division. A substantial storm drain system has been installed along the west boundary of lot 2. The applicant will coordinate storm drain needs as future development happens.

During the review process for the first phase, a parcel adjacent to Decker Lake Drive was created. The purpose for this parcel was to help preserve the necessary right-of-way for light rail. The applicants will negotiate the acquisition of this parcel as light rail development continues to move forward.

Over the years extensive fill material has been brought to this site. The developer will need to provide a grading plan for each of the future uses. In addition, a soils report will need to be provided for review by the City Engineering and Building Divisions.

As each of the proposed lots develop, additional reviews will be necessary. Therefore, it is not necessary that the review of the subdivision plat be all inclusive. The subdivision plat will contain easements and other information applicable to the division of property, but will not address site design issues typically found in commercial developments.

STAFF ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve the E-Center Amended Subdivision subject to a resolution of staff concerns noted in the analysis.
2. Continue the application for reasons determined in the Planning Commission meeting.

Applicant:
Mark Green
11077 Susan Dr.
Sandy, UT 84092

Applicant:
Paul Jensen

Discussion: The applicant, Mark Green, explained that the purpose for this amendment is primarily to help attract tenants to the development. He added that the hotels are under construction in the other section of the project. Harold Woodruff commented that the original plan showed commercial development.

Brent Fuller agreed and stated that it was the original intent to ensure the entire site was congruent and each portion was planned out with the other. By approving this amendment, he explained, there is a possibility to sell out the four separate parcels to four separate buyers. Mr. Green stated that the decision to sell hasn't been made yet and this amendment will also help for financing. He added that his company wants to keep different options open to them. Paul Jensen stated that each lot may be developed independently and separate uses will likely be utilized at each location. This requires a legal agreement for the separate lots. He added that the development is tied together by CC&R's and a common agreement among potential buyers. Commissioner Fuller stated that his concern is that separate property owners often want to develop their land the way they want rather than coordinate with their neighbors to create a positive group of buildings. Mr. Jensen replied that the property will still be subject to the overlays on the main subdivision and if the decision is made to sell the properties, the potential buyers will need to conform to the original goals for the area.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Mills moved for approval

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous - S-34-2008– Approved

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS:

C-37-2008

H & E Equipment Sign

4899 West Highway 201

Manufacturing Zone, 33.56 acres

Staff Presentation by Hannah Thiel, Planner I

Background

Doug Petersen, representing Universal Signs and H & E Equipment, is requesting a conditional use amendment for second pole sign that is proposed to be located at 4899 West Highway 201. The site was initially approved for a conditional use in 1972 under Salt Lake County's jurisdiction (C-293-1972). This Conditional Use Approval was for Wheeler Machinery and included this parcel as well as the adjacent parcel to the west.

Pole signs are allowed in the manufacturing zone, on at least 10 acres, with a conditional use approval.

The applicant is requesting a sixteen foot tall pole sign approximately one-hundred and fifty feet to the east of the existing pole sign. The sign is proposed in a landscaped area and is proposed eleven feet from the front property line, which is also the minimum setback for a sixteen foot tall pole sign.

Staff's concern with the proposed application is whether the forty-foot half width dedication of right of way for 4800 West should be considered a second frontage for the subject parcel. The forty foot half width right of way was dedicated by CR England, which is the adjacent property to the east. It is staff's policy to allow an additional pole sign on freeway oriented frontage if the property has frontage on a second frontage. The potential additional pole sign can be 'moved' or 'borrowed' from that second frontage and placed on the freeway oriented frontage. Where 4800 West has not been dedicated on the subject property, it is questionable whether that right of way should be considered a second frontage.

The concern with multiple pole signs on a frontage is that pole signs are visually obtrusive and can take away from the aesthetic quality of a site's landscaping and building design. Where pole signs along the highway often have the same impact as billboards, the separation between billboards may be a rule of thumb to adhere to for the separation needed between pole signs as a condition in the conditional use process.

Recommendations/ Staff Alternatives

1. Approval subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:
 1. That the pole sign shall meet the Sign Ordinance requirements, and that the applicant obtain a sign permit.
 2. That the two pole signs be located a minimum of 500 radial feet away from each other, which is the distance required between billboards that are not freeway oriented.
 3. That all pole signs be located a minimum of 500 radial feet away from any other pole sign on adjacent properties, which is the distance required between billboards that are not freeway oriented.
 4. That the approved pole sign uses a monopole design rather than a dipole design.
2. Continuance, for resolution of any issues that may arise at the public hearing.
3. Denial of the Conditional Use Amendment as the property does not have a second dedicated frontage, and the distance of 150 feet is too close to locate two pole signs together, or any other detrimental impacts the Planning Commission may foresee.

Applicant:

Doug Petersen

2451 S. 600 W.

Discussion: Hannah Thiel presented the application. Harold questioned whether there is a required distance between pole signs in our ordinance. Hannah replied that there is not a set distance but the ordinance states that poles should generally maintain a 100 foot separation. Hannah explained that the ordinance says an additional pole sign on a piece of property that is freeway oriented can be approved by the Planning Commission. Brent Fuller asked if another pole sign can be requested on 4800 West when it gets dedicated and developed. Hannah replied yes and explained that even without the road being dedicated, the applicant could request that now. Phil Conder asked what the frontage is for this portion of the property. Hannah answered that it is around 790 feet and the existing sign is about in the middle but slightly closer to the West. Commissioner Conder asked if there is 500 feet to the corner of the frontage from the existing pole sign. Hannah replied that the existing pole sign would have to be relocated in order to permit the approval written by staff. Jason Jones stated a potential case where two neighbors bordering a property each had two signs in their corners and questioned whether the 750 feet space requirement would still apply. Hannah replied that this is simply dealing with this property and whether or not the Planning Commission decides the pole sign should be treated as a billboard. Jason clarified that the Planning Commission does not have to consider the special requirements of billboards in this case if they choose not to. Hannah replied yes.

Doug Petersen, representing the property owner, explained that this sign cabinet is only 4 feet high. He stated that the reason the two poles are being used is because the property owner doesn't want to go through the expense of creating a large, single pole that will require a larger sign. Mr. Petersen explained that there is a considerable distance from the highway and the equipment the company is trying to sell couldn't be seen. This is a large area and the pole sign is proposed to be 450 feet to the west of the existing sign. The sign will explain that H&E sells used equipment and in this economy, it is very beneficial. Jason Jones asked if there is any problem with changing the proposed dipole to a monopole. Mr. Petersen replied that one pole will require a bigger box sign to accommodate and the applicant doesn't want anything large. Brent Fuller asked if hooks would be included on the poles to hang banners. Mr. Petersen replied that there would be no point because banners would be too low to be seen due to the small sign and the trees in the area. Terri Mills questioned if the applicant intends the sign to be seen from the frontage road or the freeway. Mr. Petersen replied that it is a little of both but mostly the frontage road. Commissioner Conder questioned if it would be appropriate to include in an approval that no banners will be displayed from the sign. Hannah replied yes.

Harold Woodruff stated that he doesn't like items two and three in the staff report because it feels too much like it is unnecessarily and unfairly mixing ordinances. Terri Mills indicated that if the sign is designed to pull customers off the frontage road, this can already be effectively done with the existing sign. Jason Jones

questioned what the difference is between a freeway oriented business and a frontage road oriented one. Hannah explained that more than one sign is allowed if it is freeway oriented and a freeway is defined by having 4 lanes and controlled access points. The reason staff considered this with the 500 foot radial separation is because of the impact the sign may have, similar to billboards. Commissioner Mills asked if there is any definition about how far a property can be from a freeway to be defined as freeway oriented. Hannah replied no. Brent questioned whether it is legal for the Planning Commission to mix two different ordinances. Hannah replied that other standards can be used to mitigate detrimental impacts on the property. The code is not being used improperly in this case. Chairman Woodruff stated that it is clear that this building is freeway oriented.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Fuller moved for approval subject to item number one in the staff approval and adding a second item that states no banner signs will be permitted on the pole sign.

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Mills	No
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Majority - C-37-2008– Approved

C-43-2008

RFG Utah LLC

2470 South Redwood Road

M Zone 3.02 Acres

The applicant is requesting conditional use approval to put a kiosk inside the Rancho Market at 2470 South Redwood Road to provide title loan, installment loan and tax preparation services. The property is zoned manufacturing (M) and the West Valley City General Plan anticipates light manufacturing uses in this area. The surrounding properties are zoned manufacturing and general commercial.

This is a conditional use because car title loans are listed as a conditional use in the manufacturing zone. The services will be offered from a kiosk inside the entrance of the market. According to the information from the applicant there will be no additional signage required for the business. The hours of operation will be from 12:00 noon to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and the business will be closed on Sundays.

The applicant has submitted a synopsis of his business plan explaining the three services the company will offer. The title loans are short term loans secured by a car title. The installment loans are five month signature loans that are not refinanced or rolled over and each payment pays down the principal and interest so at the end of the five months the loan is paid in full. The tax preparation provides basic preparation of taxes and also can help the clients apply for their tax ID numbers.

Staff Alternatives:

- Approval, subject to the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing and the following conditions:
 1. The business will not offer check cashing/deferred deposit loan services.
 2. No additional signage shall be used in the windows or on the outside of the building unless it is first approved by the Planning Commission.
- Continuance, to allow for the resolution of any issues raised at the public hearing.

Applicant:

Ryan Redford
473 S. 380 W.
Tooele, UT

Discussion: Ron presented the application. Jason Jones questioned how the rates for the loans are based. Ryan Redford, the applicant, explained that the bigger the loan is, the lower the rate will be. Jason Jones questioned whether people will earn credit. Mr. Redford explained that this is a credit establishing loan company to allow people just starting off the ability to build their credit. He stated that rates start at about 20% and go up from there. He stated that they are higher interest loans because no credit check is done on the individual and a bank account is not required. The primary focus for establishing whether or not someone is qualified for a loan is whether the individual has a stable job, etc. Commissioner Jones questioned whether there are other companies. Mr. Redford replied that there are several other companies primarily located in Hispanic locations because they are an asset to the Spanish community. Jason Jones questioned whether reports are sent to the Credit Bureau. Mr. Redford stated that this isn't done yet but is something that may happen in the future.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval subject to the two staff conditions.

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous - C-43-2008– Approved

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from July 9, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**
Approval of minutes from July 16, 2008 (Study Session) **Continued**
Approval of minutes from July 19, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**
Approval of minutes from August 13, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Continued**
Approval of minutes from August 20, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**
Approval of minutes from August 27, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**
Approval of minutes from September 3, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**
Approval of minutes from September 10, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nichole Camac, Administrative Assistant